

REMARKS

In the May 1, 2007 Office Action, claims 6-9 and 14-17 stand rejected in view of prior art. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the May 1, 2007 Office Action, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, and have added dependent claims 18 and 19. None of the claims are being amended by the current Amendment. Thus, claims 6-9 and 14-19 are pending, with claim 6 being the only independent claim. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

Entry of March 21, 2007 Amendment

In item 1 of the Office Action, the Office Action indicates that Applicants' March 21, 2007 Amendment has been entered.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

In item 3 of the Office Action, claims 6-9 and 14-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,205,325 (Groe). In response, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

In particular, independent claim 6 recites a current source being configured to provide a bias current to the amplification unit and the mixing unit, whereas the inductor 48 of Groe does not provide a bias current to the amplifier and the mixing unit simply because the transistor 44 and 46 of Groe prevents the current in the direction to the mixing stage 38 and the feedback element 26. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that this structure is **not** disclosed or suggested by Groe, Fong, or any other prior art of record. It is well settled under U.S. patent law that for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each element of the claim within the reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that

claim 6 is not anticipated by the prior art of record. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Moreover, Applicants believe that dependent claims 7-9 and 14-17 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 6, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, dependent claims 7-9 and 14-17 are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not anticipate the independent claim 6, neither does the prior art anticipate the dependent claims.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

In item 4-5 of the Office Action, claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,205,325 (Groe) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,147,559 (Fong). In response, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. Applicants respectfully assert that Groe does not disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 6 for the reasons mentioned above. Fong was cited to show an amplification unit having a capacitor connected between a first terminal and a second terminal of the amplification element. Applicants respectfully assert that Fong does not disclose or suggest the current source being configured to provide the bias current to the amplification unit and the mixing unit. Applicants respectfully assert that this arrangement is *not* disclosed or suggested by Fong, Groe, or any other prior art of record singularly or in combination. It is well settled in U.S. patent law that the mere fact that the prior art can be modified does *not* make the modification obvious, unless the prior art *suggests* the desirability of the modification. Accordingly, the prior art of record lacks any suggestion or expectation of success for combining the patents to create the Applicants' unique arrangement of a mixer circuit.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.


New Claim

Applicants have added dependent claims 18 and 19. Applicants respectfully assert that the new claims 18 and 19 are allowable since they depend from independent claim 6. Also, the new claims 18 and 19 are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not anticipate the independent claim 6, neither does the prior art anticipate the dependent claims.

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 6-9 and 14-19 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Todd M. Guise
Reg. No. 46,748

SHINJYU GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: 8/1/07

S:\07-JUL07-AO\GK-US045033 Amendment.doc